19th March 1954]

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER :—" Sir, we cannot discuss these matters with the information that we might have got from the newspapers. We must have the full text of the judgment of the High Court before we discuss this matter on the floor of the House."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I commend the suggestion of the hon. Member to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition can get a copy of the judgment and go through it carefully."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" ஹைகோர்ட் ஜட்ஜுமண்டில் அது அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய சொந்தப்பண்ணை நிலங்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும் என்று கூறிஇருக்கிறது. இந்தச் சட்டம் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் பண்ணை நிலத்திற்கு என்னவரி விகிதாசாரம் இருக்கிறதோ அதே விகிதாசாரவரிதான் கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று இருக்கிறது. ஆதலால் இதைச்சர்க்கார் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரயோசனை செய்வார்களா?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" As the hon. Member coming from the Melmalayanur Constituency said, we are both talking without the judgment of the High Court in our hands. It is better to have the judgment first, and then we shall see."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—" According to the Act, there was a provision that the highest rate that prevails in the district must be charged. Now the Government have changed the provision and said that the highest rate that prevails in the taluk should be charged. I want to know under what rule and on what basis they have changed the provision. May I know whether the Government will consider modifying the provision to the effect that the rate obtaining in the adjoining villages, instead of the entire taluk, should be charged? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Yes, Sir, the Government can take that decision also with regard to fixing the rate obtaining in the adjoining villages. I may inform the hon. Member that the Government are doing what is most reasonable under the present circumstances."

Implementation of the award of Industrial Tribunal by the management of the Liberator Press.

* 266 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether the award of the Industrial Tribunal in the Liberator Press case has been implemented by the management of the said press or not?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" No Sir. The Government are informed that the Press has gone into voluntary liquidation."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" May I know, Sir, if the Government can insist on implementing the award by writing to the Liquidator of the Press? " 10-50 a.m.

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Even now, Sir, the Labour Officer has been asked to obtain applications from

the workers claiming the amounts due to them under the award, so that necessary action can be taken to assess the claims of the workers.''

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—'' May I know when this particular dispute arose, when it was referred for adjudication, when the report of the Adjudicator was received and why there was a long delay in implementing the award? ''

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—'' In July 1951 the Government referred the dispute between the workers and the management for adjudication. The Industrial Tribunal gave its award on 21st October 1953. The reasons for this delay are many, Sir. When the Tribunal took up the case for enquiry, the management filed an application requesting permission to be represented by an advocate in the proceedings before the Tribunal. The workers' representative objected to this. The Tribunal passed an order on 24th September 1951 refusing to grant permission to the Management to be represented by an advocate, in view of the mandatory provisions of section 36 (4) of the Act. The Management filed a Writ petition in the High Court for quashing the order of the Tribunal. The Management also obtained an order from the High Court staying the proceedings before the Tribunal. The High Court gave a judgment on 29th September 1952 dismissing the Writ petition. The Management filed a Letters Patent Appeal against the judgment which was dismissed by the High Court on 18th September 1953. Thereafter, the Tribunal enquired into the dispute and passed an award, dated 12th October 1953. Thus, there has been no appreciable delay either on the part of the Government or on the part of the Tribunal.''

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—'' கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்ன விவரங்களிலிருந்து தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இண்டஸ்டிரியல் டிரிப்யூனலிலிருந்து ஒரு உத்திரவு வாங்குவது சிரமமான காரியம் என்று தெரிகிறது. அப்படி அவ்வளவு சிரமப்பட்டு உத்திரவை வாங்கியும் சர்க்கார் இன்னும் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்காது இருப்பது எனக்கு ஒன்றுமே புரியவில்லை. ''

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—'' Sir, it is the law under which we work. But I can tell this Honourable House that it is not only the management which files writ petitions and applications. Whenever judgments are not suitable or favourable, the workers also file writ applications. I am only saying that *after the award* of the Tribunal, we have done our best and there is no delay whatever.''

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—'' Sir, when the Letters Patent Appeal was there, was any stay granted by the High Court? ''

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—'' I have no information, Sir. But I may say that that was also discussed on 18th September 1953.''

19th March 1954]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" இந்த இண்டஸ்டிரியல் டிரிபுனல் தீர்ப்பு கூறுவதற்கு எவ்வளவு கால தாமதம் ஏறபட்டது என்பதுபற்றி காரணங்களுடன் கனம் மந்திரி எடுத்துச் சொன்னார்கள். அந்த தீப்பு வந்தும்கூட அதை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவராதது பற்றி சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது தகவல் கொடுக்க முடியுமா ? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" As I said, we have already advised the workers to file their claims and incidentally, I gave the information that this Press has gone into liquidation."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, may I know who the Managing Director of that Liberator Press was, when the dispute arose and is it not a fact that the press was stopped due to the strike of the workers and that it did not go into voluntary liquidation? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I have no information, Sir, as to who the proprietor was. I thank the hon. Member for the information as to why it was closed."

Evasion of the provisions of the Factories Act by beedi manufacturers.

* 267 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state what measures the Government have taken to prevent beedi manufacturers from opening branches in some other's name to evade the provisions of the Factories Act?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" It is not possible for the Government to prevent beedi manufacturers from dispersing the workers with a view to evade the Factories Act."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Sir, in order to make the beedi industry an organized industry, will the Government consider whenever they issue licences to factory owners whether the factory owners are prepared to employ 10 workers or more, excepting individual workers who want to earn their livelihood, so that Government can enforce the Factory Act effectively? May I know whether the Government is prepared to adopt this procedure to make the industry an organized one on a factory basis? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, the question was so long that by the time the hon. Member came to the end of it, I had already forgotten the earlier part."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has put a number of questions. The hon. Member will please repeat his question."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Sir, may I know whether the Government are prepared, before issuing licences to persons who want to run a factory, to make a condition that such persons should appoint 10 or more workers and thus will Government put the industry on a factory basis? "